03-27-06

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. ___**10003655-1**___

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s):	Dan Matheson	Confirmation No.:	9577
Application No.:	09/680,604	Examiner:	Z.E. Cabrera
Filing Date:	October 6, 2000	Group Art Unit:	2125

Title: **OBJECT MODEL FOR DECISION AND ISSUE TRACKING**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on ___February 8, 2006___ .

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) $500.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

☐ (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d)) for the total number of months checked below:

☐ 1st Month $120	☐ 2nd Month $450	☐ 3rd Month $1020	☐ 4th Month $1590

☐ The extension fee has already been filed in this application.

☒ (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of ___$ 500___ . At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

☒ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV568255696US in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Deposit: March 24, 2006

OR

☐ I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571)273-8300.

Date of facsimile:

Typed Name: Laura Horton
Signature: _Laura Horton_

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Matheson

By _____

Michael A. Paplas

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg No. :	40,381
Date :	March 24, 2006
Telephone :	(214) 855-8186

Rev 10/05 (AplBrief)

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Docket No.: 10003655-1
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Dan Matheson

Application No.: 09/680,604

Confirmation No.: 9577

Filed: October 6, 2000

Art Unit: 2125

For: OBJECT MODEL FOR DECISION AND
ISSUE TRACKING

Examiner: Z. E. Cabrera

APPEAL BRIEF

MS Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

As required under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(a), this Brief is filed within two months of the Notice of Appeal filed in this case on February 8, 2006, and is in furtherance of said Notice of Appeal.

The fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2) are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

This brief contains items under the following headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 and M.P.E.P. § 1206:

I.	Real Party In Interest
II	Related Appeals and Interferences
III.	Status of Claims
IV.	Status of Amendments
V.	Summary of Claimed Subject Matter
VI.	Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

I.   REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is:

Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware corporation.

II.   RELATED APPEALS, INTERFERENCES, AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

There are no other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

III.   STATUS OF CLAIMS

A.   Total Number of Claims in Application

There are 17 claims pending in application, numbered 1-6, 8-13, and 15-19.

B.   Current Status of Claims

    1.   Claims canceled: 7, 14, 20

    2.   Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None

    3.   Claims pending: 1-6, 8-13, 15-19

    4.   Claims allowed: None

    5.   Claims rejected: 1-6, 8-13, 15-19

C.   Claims On Appeal

The claims on appeal are claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-19

IV.   STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Applicant did not file an Amendment After Final Rejection. Thus, the claims on appeal are those as rejected in the Final Office Action mailed December 23, 2005, from which the present appeal was taken. The appealed claims are listed in the Claims Appendix attached hereto.

V.   SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

According to claim 1, the computer system for capturing decision-related data related to a product design comprises: a question software interface for capturing a question in a question object that encapsulates text-based information related to a design issue associated with said product design [pg. 8, lines 6-9; pg. 7 lines 14-18; Fig. 3, 220]. The system also comprises an answer software interface for capturing an answer in an answer object that encapsulates text-based information addressing information encapsulated in a selected question object and that is linked to said selected question object [pg. 9 line 30- pg. 10 line 2; Fig. 3, 240]. The system further comprises a decision software interface for capturing a decision in a decision object that encapsulates text-based information defining a product requirement in response to information in said selected question object and that is linked to said selected question object [pg. 7, lines 1-4; pg. 7, lines 14-17; Fig. 3, 210].

According to claim 2, the computer system according to claim 1, wherein: each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object is stored in a tool-neutral persistent form [pg. 6, lines 1-12].

According to claim 3, computer system according to claim 2, wherein: each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object is stored in a separate relational database, wherein associations between each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object are captured using foreign keys [pg. 8, lines 29-34; pg. 9, lines 10-13].

According to claim 4, the computer system according to claim 1, wherein: said question software interface captures an association of said question object with a decision object [pg. 7, lines 14-15; Fig. 2 110, 120].

According to claim 8, the method for capturing decision-related data related to a product design using a computer system comprises: capturing, by a question software interface of said computer system, a question in a question object that encapsulates text-based information related to a design issue associated with said product design [pg. 8, lines 6-9; pg. 7 lines 14-18; Fig. 3, 220]. The method also comprises capturing, by an answer software

interface of said computer system, an answer in an answer object that encapsulates text-based information addressing information encapsulated in a selected question object and that is linked to said selected question object [pg. 9 line 30- pg. 10 line 2; Fig. 3, 240]. The method further comprises capturing, by a decision software interface of said computer system, a decision in a decision object that encapsulates text-based information defining a product requirement in response to information in said selected question object and that is linked to said selected question object [pg. 7, lines 1-4; pg. 7, lines 14-17; Fig. 3, 210].

According to claim 9, the method according to claim 8, wherein: each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object is stored in a tool-neutral persistent form [pg. 6, lines 1-12].

According to claim 10, method in accordance with claim 9, comprising: storing each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object in a separate relational database, wherein associations between each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object are captured using foreign keys [pg. 8, lines 29-34; pg. 9, lines 10-13].

According to claim 11, the method according claim 8, comprising: capturing an association of said question object with a decision object [pg. 7, lines 14-15; Fig. 2 110, 120].

According to claim 15, the computer readable storage medium tangibly embodying program instructions implementing a method for capturing decision-related data related to a product design, the method comprising: capturing a question in a question object that encapsulates text-based information related to a design issue associated with said product design [pg. 8, lines 6-9; pg. 7 lines 14-18; Fig. 3, 220]. The method also comprises capturing an answer in an answer object that encapsulates text-based information addressing information encapsulated in a selected question object and that is linked to said selected question object [pg. 9 line 30- pg. 10 line 2; Fig. 3, 240]. The method further comprises capturing a decision in a decision object that encapsulates text-based information defining a product requirement in response to information in said selected question object and that is linked to said selected question object [pg. 7, lines 1-4; pg. 7, lines 14-17; Fig. 3, 210].

According to claim 16, the computer readable storage medium according to claim 15, wherein: each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object is stored in a tool-neutral persistent form [pg. 6, lines 1-12].

According to claim 17, the computer readable storage medium of claim 16, the method comprising: storing each of said question object, said answer object, and said

decision object in a separate relational database, wherein associations between each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object are captured using foreign keys [pg. 8, lines 29-34; pg. 9, lines 10-13].

According to claim 18, the computer readable storage medium implementing the method of claim 15, the method comprising: capturing an association of said question object with a decision object [pg. 7, lines 14-15; Fig. 2 110, 120].

VI.   GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A.   Claims 1, 8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being   anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,206 to Sebastian et al (hereinafter "Sebastian").

B.   Claims 2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebastian in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,513 to Thackston (hereinafter "Thackston").

C.   Claims 3, 10, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebastian in view of Thackston and further in view of U.S. Patent   Application Publication No. 2002/0012007 A1 to Twigg (hereinafter "Twigg").

VII.   ARGUMENT

Appellant respectfully traverses the outstanding rejections of the pending claims, and requests that the Board reverse the outstanding rejections in light of the remarks contained herein. The claims do not stand or fall together. Instead, Appellant presents separate arguments for various independent and dependent claims. Each of these arguments is separately argued below and presented with separate headings and sub-heading as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii).

A.   <u>Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Sebastian</u>

Claims 1, 8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticpated by Sebastian.

It is well settled that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. *see* M.P.E.P. § 2131. Moreover, in order for a prior art reference to be anticipatory

under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." *see* M.P.E.P. § 2131; citing *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Furthermore, in order for a prior art reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." *see* M.P.E.P. § 2131; *citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a computer system comprising a question software interface for capturing a question in a question object, an answer software interface for capturing an answer in an answer object that is linked to the selected question object, and a decision software interface for capturing a decision in a decision object that is linked to the selected question object. In the Final Action the Examiner points to Sebastian, at col. 5 lines 19-24 and col. 15 lines 34-36, to teach "an answer object that is linked to a selected question object." *see* Final Action, pg. 5. In doing so, the Examiner equates Sebastian's output to an answer. *Id.* However, at the Examiner's citation Sebastian merely describes a material selector module whose output includes "a list of material properties and associated threshold values for a part...." *see* Sebastian at col. 15, lines 32-35. Sebastian further describes a template linked to a selected question object. *See id.* at col. 11, line 35-col. 12, line 46. However, the feature template of Sebastian does not comprise an answer object that is linked to a selected question object. The Appellant respectfully submits that Sebastian's output is not an answer. This follows from the fact that, in Sebastian, no question is being asked. As such, Sebastian does not teach an answer object that is linked to the selected question object.

Also, Sebastian does not teach a decision object that is linked to a selected question object. In the Final Action the Examiner points to Sebastian, at col. 6 lines 40-44 and col. 17 lines 4-35, to satisfy this limitation. At the Examiner's citation, Sebastian merely describes evaluating economics of a project design into account to determined decision and constraints before detailed designs are made. See Sebastian, col. 6 lines 40-43. The Appellant respectfully submits that evaluating economics of product design before making detailed designs does not constitute a decision object linked to a question object. Sebastian further teaches that the material selector module "can provide its output in the template notation of the present invention." *See* Sebastian at col. 15, lines 35-37. However, the feature template

of Sebastian does not comprise a decision object that is linked to a selected question object. Accordingly, Sebastian does not teach at least the claim 1 limitations of an answer object that is linked to a selected question object and a decision object that is linked to a selected question object. Thus, Sebastian does not anticipate claim 1. As such, Appellant respectfully requests that his rejection be overturned.

Claim 8

Claim 8 recites a method for capturing decision-related data comprising capturing a question in a question object, capturing an answer in an answer object that is linked to the selected question object, and capturing a decision in a decision object that is linked to the selected question object. Sebastian teaches a material selector module whose output includes "a list of material properties and associated threshold values for a part...." *See* Sebastian at col. 15, lines 32-35. Sebastian does not teach capturing an answer in an answer object that is linked to the selected question object. Nor does Sebastian teach capturing a decision in a decision object that is linked to a selected question object. Sebastian further teaches that the material selector module "can provide its output in the template notation of the present invention." *See* Sebastian at col. 15, lines 35-37. However, the feature template of Sebastian does not comprise an answer object that is linked to a selected question object. *See id.* at col. 11, line 35-col. 12, line 46. Nor does the feature template of Sebastian comprise a decision object that is linked to a selected question object. Accordingly, Sebastian cannot teach at least the claim 8 limitations of capturing an answer in an answer object that is linked to a selected question object or capturing a decision in a decision object that is linked to a selected question object. Thus, Sebastian does not anticipate claim 8. As such, Appellant requests the rejection of claim 8 be overturned.

Claim 15

Claim 15 recites a computer readable storage medium tangibly embodying program instructions implementing a method comprising capturing a question in a question object, capturing an answer in an answer object that is linked to the selected question object, and capturing a decision in a decision object that is linked to the selected question object. Sebastian teaches a material selector module whose output includes "a list of material properties and associated threshold values for a part...." *See* Sebastian at col. 15, lines 32-35.

Sebastian does not teach capturing an answer in an answer object that is linked to the selected question object. Nor does Sebastian teach capturing a decision in a decision object that is linked to a selected question object. Sebastian further teaches that the material selector module "can provide its output in the template notation of the present invention." *See* Sebastian at col. 15, lines 35-37. However, the feature template of Sebastian does not comprise an answer object that is linked to a selected question object. *See id.* at col. 11, line 35-col. 12, line 46. Nor does the feature template of Sebastian comprise a decision object that is linked to a selected question object. Accordingly, Sebastian cannot teach at least the claim 15 limitations of capturing an answer in an answer object that is linked to a selected question object and capturing a decision in a decision object that is linked to a selected question object. Thus, Sebastian does not anticipate claim 15. Therefore, Appellant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 15 be overturned.

B.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Sebastian in view of Thackston

Claims 2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Sebastian in view of Thackston.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art cited must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143. Without admitting that the first or second criteria is satisfied, the Appellant respectfully asserts that the Examiner's rejection fails to satisfy the third criteria.

Each of claims 2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 16, and 18-19 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 8, or 15, and comprise all limitations of the base claim from which it depends. As shown above in relation to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), Sebastian does not teach all limitations of claims 1, 8, and 15. Accordingly, Sebastian does not teach or suggest all limitations of claims 2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 16, and 18-19. Thackston does not cure the deficiencies of Sebastian with respect to claims 1, 8, and 15. Thackston is merely relied upon for disclosing "data neutrality" in a "virtual collaborative environment." *See* Thackston at col. 5, lines 47-51. Accordingly, Sebastian in view of Thackston does not teach or suggest all limitations of claims 1, 8, and 15. Thus, claims 2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 16, and 18-19 are not obvious over the cited references based on at least their respective dependencies from claims

1, 8, and 15. Additionally, the claims enumerated below are patentable for other reasons set forth herein.

Claim 2

Claim 2 recites "each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object is stored in a tool-neutral persistent form." In the Final Action the Examiner points to Thackston, at col. 4 lines 47-51, to satisfy this limitation. *see* Final Action pg. 4. However, at the Examiner's citation Thackston describes data neutrality supporting the upload and conversion of design modes from various formats into a single standard format. The Appellant respectfully submits that data neutrality does not constitute storing objects in a tool-neutral persistent form as recited in claim 2. There is no mention of storing anything. Also, the data to which Thackston refers is not a question object, answer object or a decision object. Therefore, the Examiner's suggested combination fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 2. The Appellant requests that the Board overturn the rejection of record.

Claims 9 and 16

Claims 9 and 16 recite "storing each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object in a tool-neutral persistent form." In the Final Action the Examiner points to Thackston, at col. 4 lines 47-51, to satisfy this limitation. *see* Final Action pg. 4. However, at the Examiner's citation Thackston describes data neutrality supporting the upload and conversion of design modes from various formats into a single standard format. The Appellant respectfully submits that data neutrality is not the same as storing objects in a tool-neutral persistent form as recited in claim 2. There is no mention of storing anything. Also, the data to which Thackston refers is not a question object, answer object or a decision object. Therefore, the Examiner's suggested combination fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 9 and 16. The Appellant requests that the Board overturn the rejection of these claims.

Claim 4

Claim 4 recites "said question software interface captures an association of said question object with a decision object." In the Final Action the Examiner points to Thackston, at Figs. 19 & 23, to satisfy this limitation. *see* Final Action pg. 4. In doing so, the Examiner equates "Team Member Interaction" (Fig. 19, 1926) or "Server Generates Query Set" (Fig. 23, 4320) to a question interface or question object. Numeral 1926 of Fig. 19B does no depict a question interface. Rather, numeral 1926 merely refers to team member

interaction; no question object is present. Numeral 4320 of Fig. 23 does not capture an association of said question object with a decision object; no decision object is present. Therefore, the Examiner's suggested combination fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 4. The Appellant requests that the Board overturn the rejection of record.

Claims 11 and 18

Claims 11 and 18 recite "capturing an association of said question object with a decision object." As the Appellant best understands, the Examiner points to Thackston, at Figs. 19 & 23, to satisfy this limitation. *see* Final Action pg. 4. In doing so, the Examiner equates "Team Member Interaction" (Fig. 19, 1926) or "Server Generates Query Set" (Fig. 23, 4320) to a question interface or question object. Numeral 1926 of Fig. 19B does no depict a question interface. Rather, numeral 1926 merely refers to team member interaction; no question object is present. Numeral 4320 of Fig. 23 does not capture an association of said question object with a decision object; no decision object is present. Therefore, the Examiner's suggested combination fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 11 and 18. The Appellant requests that the Board overturn the rejection of record.

C.   Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Sebastian in view of Thackston in further view of Twigg

Claims 3, 10, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Sebastian in view of Thackston, further in view of Twigg. Each of claims 3, 10, and 17 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 8, or 15, and comprises all limitations of the base claim from which it depends. As shown above in relation to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), Sebastian does not teach all limitations of claims 1, 8, and 15. Accordingly, Sebastian does not teach or suggest all limitations of claims 3, 10, and 17. Neither Thackston nor Twigg cure the above-identified deficiencies of Sebastian with respect to claims 1, 8, and 15. Thackston is merely relied upon for disclosing "data neutrality" in a "virtual collaborative environment." *See* Thackston at col. 5, lines 47-51. Twigg is merely relied upon for disclosing multiple databases for design files. *See* Twigg at paragraph 0038. Accordingly, Sebastian in view of Thackston further in view of Twigg do not teach or suggest all limitations of claims 1, 8, and 15 and thus claims 3, 10, and 17 are not obvious over the cited references at least for the reasons set forth above. In addition, claims 3, 10, and 17 are patentable for other reasons set forth herein.

Claims 3, 10, and 17 recite "each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object is stored in a separate relational database, wherein associations between each

of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object are captured using foreign keys." In the Final Action the Examiner points to paragraph [0038], among other citations, to satisfy this limitation. The Appellant respectfully points out that the Examiner has failed to show where Twigg teaches the objects are stored in a separate relational database. With reference to the Examiner's citation, Twigg merely describes design file 22 contained within database 20. However, Twigg does not disclose a separate relational database file for each defined interface. Moreover, the Appellant respectfully submits that the Class #, Description, Note, Cost are not foreign keys as the Examiner contends. Rather, these items are fields inherent within a design file. Therefore, the Examiner's suggested combination fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 3, 10, and 17. The Appellant requests that the Board overturn the rejection of record.

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

Claims Involved in the Appeal of Application Serial No. 09/680,604

1.   (Previously Presented) A computer system for capturing decision-related data related to a product design, comprising:

a question software interface for capturing a question in a question object that encapsulates text-based information related to a design issue associated with said product design;

an answer software interface for capturing an answer in an answer object that encapsulates text-based information addressing information encapsulated in a selected question object and that is linked to said selected question object; and

a decision software interface for capturing a decision in a decision object that encapsulates text-based information defining a product requirement in response to information in said selected question object and that is linked to said selected question object.

2.   (Previously Presented) A computer system in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object is stored in a tool-neutral persistent form.

3.   (Previously Presented) A computer system in accordance with claim 2, wherein:

each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object is stored in a separate relational database, wherein associations between each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object are captured using foreign keys.

4.   (Previously Presented) A computer system in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

said question software interface captures an association of said question object with a decision object.

5.   (Previously Presented) A computer system in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

said answer software interface captures an association of said answer object with a question object.

6.   (Previously Presented) A computer system in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

said decision software interface captures an association of said decision object with an answer object.

7.   (Canceled)

8.   (Previously Presented) A method for capturing decision-related data related to a product design using a computer system, comprising:

capturing, by a question software interface of said computer system, a question in a question object that encapsulates text-based information related to a design issue associated with said product design;

capturing, by an answer software interface of said computer system, an answer in an answer object that encapsulates text-based information addressing information encapsulated in a selected question object and that is linked to said selected question object; and

capturing, by a decision software interface of said computer system, a decision in a decision object that encapsulates text-based information defining a product requirement in response to information in said selected question object and that is linked to said selected question object.

9.   (Original) A method in accordance with claim 8, comprising:

storing each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object in a tool-neutral persistent form.

10.   (Original) A method in accordance with claim 9, comprising:

storing each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object in a separate relational database, wherein associations between each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object are captured using foreign keys.

11.   (Original) A method in accordance with claim 8, comprising:

capturing an association of said question object with a decision object.

12.   (Original) A method in accordance with claim 8, comprising:

capturing an association of said answer object with a question object.

13.   (Original) A method in accordance with claim 8, comprising:

capturing an association of said decision object with an answer object.

14.   (Canceled)

15.   (Previously Presented) A computer readable storage medium tangibly embodying program instructions implementing a method for capturing decision-related data related to a product design, the method comprising the steps of:

capturing a question in a question object that encapsulates text-based information related to a design issue associated with said product design;

capturing an answer in an answer object that encapsulates text-based information addressing information encapsulated in a selected question object and that is linked to said selected question object; and

capturing a decision in a decision object that encapsulates text-based information defining a product requirement in response to information in said selected question object and that is linked to said selected question object.

16.   (Original) The computer readable storage medium of claim 15, the method comprising:

storing each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object in a tool-neutral persistent form.

17.   (Original) The computer readable storage medium of claim 16, the method comprising:

storing each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object in a separate relational database, wherein associations between each of said question object, said answer object, and said decision object are captured using foreign keys.

18.   (Original) The computer readable storage medium of claim 15, the method comprising:

capturing an association of said question object with a decision object.

19.   (Original) The computer readable storage medium of claim 15, the method comprising:

capturing an association of said answer object with a question object.

20.   (Canceled)

IX.   EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by or relied upon by the examiner is being submitted.

X.   RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

No related proceedings are referenced in II. above, or copies of decisions in related proceedings are not provided, hence no Appendix is included.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV568255696US in an envelope addressed to: MS Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date of Deposit: March 24, 2006

Typed Name: Laura Horton

Signature: _____

Respectfully submitted,

By_____
         Michael A. Papalas
         Reg. No.: 40,381
Date: March 24, 2006
Telephone No. (214) 855-8186